



METHODIST PROTESTANT.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

For the Methodist Protestant.

MARYLAND.

Deer Creek Circuit, Harford Cy. Oct. 29, 1833.

Dear Brother,—The first Camp-meeting for this Circuit, held at the Wesleyan Chapel, commenced the 18th of September, and continued five days. There were sixteen tents, (most of them of the largest size) erected on the ground. We were favored with fine weather. The congregations on Sabbath morning and Tuesday, were large and respectable. The preaching was powerful, and being accompanied by the spirit and power of God, to the hearts of the people, produced correspondent effects. It is correctly ascertained, that upwards of thirty white, and about fifteen colored persons were converted at this meeting. Twenty-two of the former have joined the church. Gentlemen and ladies of respectability, who attended the meeting, profess to have been delighted with the preaching, and the order of the meeting. They have said they never saw such uniformly good behaviour at a camp-meeting before. And be it said to the credit of the people of this county, that I never saw better order at a meeting of this kind, and I have attended many. We are truly thankful to the Great Head of the Church, for the manifestation of his mercy at this meeting, in the awakening and conversion of souls, and in the quickening and reviving of his children. This was truly a time of refreshing! a season of joy! a meeting that will be remembered in eternity!

The second Camp-meeting for this Circuit, held near New Market, on the York road, commenced 27th of September. It was also continued five days, during which time we had fine weather with the exception of one day. The congregations were not very large, but very attentive. The behaviour was good—there was no disorder during the meeting. The ministers on this occasion laboured faithfully, and the Lord blessed their labours abundantly. They will have stars in their crowns in the kingdom of glory, I trust, from this meeting. The Lord was present from the commencement to the close of the meeting, and displayed his power and grace every day, in the conviction and conversion of precious souls. It is supposed that between thirty and forty experienced a change of heart at this meeting. Eleven of whom have joined the church—further accessions are anticipated. Our members, generally, appear to be in pursuit of holiness of heart—harmony and love prevail among us! Oh that the Lord may keep us of one mind, that we may be humble, persevering Christians; ever rising in the Divine image, until he shall call us home, is the prayer of Your Brother in Christ,

J. W. PORTER.

For the Methodist Protestant.

A protracted meeting will be held at Bohemia Village, on the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal,

to commence the 22d inst. at early candle light, to which we invite our friends, and the public generally.

JOHN W. WILSON.

New Castle Circuit, Nov. 6, 1833.

OHIO CONFERENCE.

Extracts from the Minutes of the Conference.

The committee to whom was referred the president's communication concerning love-feasts and class-meetings, beg leave to recommend the following to be adopted by conference, as its judgment in the matter, and to be published in our periodical for the general information of the church.

In regard to love-feasts, our discipline makes it the duty of superintendents "to renew the tickets quarterly for the admission of members into love-feasts in stations, and to give notes to serious persons who desire to be present."—Page 50. Now as we have not one discipline for stations and another for the country, it is certainly a fair construction, that although tickets and notes of admission are not used in circuits, yet the superintendent is required to have an oversight of the matter, so far as to ascertain who are members of our church, and who shall be admitted with them into love-feasts. Consequently it is utterly foreign from our government for love-feasts to be held with open doors; or in other words, for the members of our church to call the public together when they speak to each other of their religious experience.

In reference to class meetings, our constitution places them with the Lord's supper, private and family prayer, the public worship of Almighty God, and other means of grace. It makes it the duty of a class-leader to meet his class once a week, and the duty of superintendents "to visit all the classes, at least once a quarter, if practicable." Now this cannot mean, to visit the members at their own houses, but to them at class; consequently if we admit that it is not the duty of each member to attend his class we at once nullify the duty both of the class-leader and the superintendent, by giving the members a right to break up the class, by omitting to attend.

Our government does not subject the members to the same immediate liability to expulsion for neglecting class-meetings as for positive acts of transgression, "sufficient to exclude a person from the kingdom of grace and glory;" but places class-meetings with other means of grace and duties required by the word of God, and says, "the neglect of duties required by the word of God, shall subject the offender to admonition, and if persisted in, after repeated admonitions, to expulsion." See the Constitution page 30. Accordingly at page 74, we are informed how these "repeated admonitions" shall be given: "Members of the church who habitually neglect these means of grace, shall first be admonished by their leader; then if they refuse to amend, the case shall be reported to the su-

perintendent, who shall admonish them a second time; if all shall be unavailing after sufficient trial, the superintendent shall propose to them voluntarily to withdraw from the fellowship of the church, if they agree with the proposal they shall be recorded as withdrawn; but if they refuse and still will not amend, they shall be liable to a trial before a committee, who shall have authority to reprove, censure, or exclude them, as in their judgment the nature of the case may require; provided, that no person be excluded except for a habitual neglect of these means of grace."

Some have supposed, that because the plural is here used, no member can be proceeded against for neglect of class-meetings, unless he can be convicted also, of neglecting all the means of grace. But this is an inadmissible construction, for the following plain reasons; first it would free delinquent members from a liability to admonition, and relieve both leaders and ministers from the duty of reproving for any one habitual neglect of duty, till it be first ascertained that the delinquent has neglected all duties: for where the constitution enjoins admonition, it uses the plural as well as when it points out the mode of trial. Admonition is to be given for the neglect of duties,"—and "members who habitually neglect these means of grace shall first be admonished by the leader—then by the superintendent." Shall the leader and superintendent here insist, that however habitual the neglect may be in regard to any one duty, yet the individual is not to be admonished, till it shall be made appear that he has neglected all duties? This plea would be as feasible, in omitting the duty of reproof, as in omitting any other part of the process pointed out in the constitution.

Secondly, such a construction would favor the assumption, that no man can be liable to a judicial process, or to a penalty for habitually breaking any one of the ten commandments, until it be made appear that he has literally broken them all.

Thirdly, it is a construction which flies in the face of apostolic authority. "If any man keep the whole law," says an apostle, "and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." He breaks the principle of the government, and consequently renounces the essence of its authority. So we say of the means of grace; a habitual neglect of any one of them, implies a disregard of the basis on which they all rest.

[To be Continued.]

LOOKING AT GOD IN CHRIST.

There are no saving views of God but in Christ, and there are no gracious views God hath of men but in Christ. If we look on God out of Christ, we are dazzled with an overwhelming, confounding Majesty; if God look on us out of Christ, he seeth hateful and hated sinners. Trail.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

For the Methodist Protestant.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL AND SYSTEMATICAL GOVERNMENT.

Only let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ. Phil. 1. 27.

It is an old maxim, and as true, as it is old, "That circumstances alter cases." The circumstances of the general church, and of particular churches may vary, but those of the primitive church, were in many respects peculiar to itself. What then were its circumstances? All its members, previous to the conversion of Cornelius, were Jews by birth and education. Its first ministers had been instructed and appointed by the Messiah himself, and were inspired by the pentecostal effusion of the holy Spirit. In common with the Jews, being regarded as a Jewish sect, it was tolerated by the Roman Emperors, who like all other absolute governments, tolerated or persecuted the different religious orders in the empire, at pleasure. It was persecuted by the Jews to the utmost extent, they were permitted by the Roman government. It had by Divine right, or dispensation, more liberty than the Jewish church. Its doors were open to Gentile converts, who were admitted to all its rights and privileges. No system of government, or constitution and form of discipline was formed for it, by Jesus Christ himself, as head of the church, or by the Apostles under the direction of the Holy Spirit, or by its ministers and members in convention assembled. How then, was the primitive church governed? According to these and other existing circumstances. But was not its government copied from the Jewish church? Evidence is wanting to prove it. Though it has been long and earnestly asserted, it is inconsistent with the advance of religious liberty. At the head of the Jewish government there was an hereditary priesthood. All the services of the temple, and of the altar were to be performed by the tribe of Levi, and the house of Aaron. The law restricted the high priesthood to that family; and so exclusive was the law, that the Messiah being of the tribe of Judah, and of the order of Melchizedec, could not take any part in those services.

One of the reasons for supposing, that the Jewish priesthood was taken for a model, seems to be, that converted Jews knew more of their former laws, than of any other. Does not this fact, tend strongly to a contrary conclusion?—Was any one among the Apostles a descendant of Aaron? What, a Jew by birth and education, regardless of genealogy, take the office of high priest, or one like it! what Jews in like circumstances submit to, or acknowledge such an office!! May not this well be doubted in the absence of all scripture authority in its favour?—Hereditary power of any kind, is considered as an abridgement of liberty. Is not a hereditary high priesthood, as the head of a hierarchy, to be regarded in the same point of view? Now, the greater degree of liberty in the Christian church, is so plainly set forth in the New Testament, that he who runs may read it; it appears not only in particular texts; it imbues all its pages, and is the spirit of the volume.

The primitive church was called into the glorious liberty of the children of God; the Son of God, the Messiah had made it free indeed!—How then, while it stood fast in this liberty, could it copy out of the old law, which gendered to bondage, a high priesthood, with its hierarchical consequences? To set up such a priest-

hood without any regard to birth-right, was not to copy; it was to innovate. In order that all things should become new, must not the old priesthood have passed away among other old things? In matters, pertaining to government and discipline in the primitive church, the greater or less degree of liberty must not be overlooked; as it must materially affect, if not entirely change results. The frequent cautions against the misuse or the abuse of liberty, prove that it was regarded as an element in the new order of things, not to be dispensed with. The power of government and the liberty of the governed, are relative, and proportional, like the scale beam, when one end rises, the other is depressed. The amount of freedom of thought and volition as well as action, may be known, by knowing the amount of governing power.—To suppose, as many do, that the discipline of the primitive church was formed and administered upon the Jewish model, and still to admit the superior degree of its liberty; is to suppose a state of things inconsistent with the peace of any community.

But, a mere liberal church, while it is persecuted, or opposed by a less liberal one, cannot fully exert its own inherent, or proper degree of governing power. Persecution, under all circumstances, has a tendency to suspend; or to derange the regular operations of church discipline. A striking example of the effects of persecuting or opposing power, is of modern date. The rulers of the French, held the Pope as a prisoner. In the mean time a circular letter, with the Pope's signature, was addressed to all the Catholics. What reception did it meet with—was it complied with? No. It was unanimously rejected. If you wish us to obey the holy father, said they, set him at liberty, that he may be free to write his own thoughts and to give us proof that they are his thoughts. For similar reasons, these same Catholics rejected all the proposals to restore the Pope to Rome, and not restore him the government of Rome; considering that he would be only a state prisoner. Now the Apostles were often imprisoned, and in chains. This is a strong case, and renders a detail of others (others may be found) unnecessary. Admitting, for argument's sake, that Peter was a Pope, that the Popes are his successors, and that they are infallible, it appears, that in the judgment of Catholics themselves, a Pope may be so affected by persecution, as to suspend his governing power. This example may also help to account for the manner in which St. Paul sent most of his letters by his confidential friends to the churches. Could St. Peter have acted as high priest in captivity—in prison—in chains. Was the primitive church bound to obey mandates bearing the name of Nero's prisoner in Rome? or could a member of the church in a similar situation obey them? It is evident, that actual persecution tends to deprive both ministers and members of any church of a portion of their liberty. And it is equally evident, that in a church whose members are mentally, and morally free, free to think and to will, as well as to act, ministerial power must be in a great measure limited to argument and persuasion. Freemen cannot be compelled. When the powers of the Jewish high priests have been copied, it has commonly been for the purpose of introducing or of maintaining what is called "a yoke of bondage."

The legal high priesthood would have been useless, in the primitive church, it is so, in all churches, both in theory and practice. No end

or object remained to be answered by it after the day of Pentecost. The Messiah, the great high priest over the house of God, had passed into the heavens, and had sent the comforter. Had there been a rival priesthood as a temporal head, for temporal purposes, it could not have competed with the old hierarchy, as Christians were only tolerated as a Jewish sect. Gallio, it is said, supposed the dispute to be about some question of the Jewish law, and would be no judge of such matters—and they beat Sosthenes, and Gallio cared for none of these things, nor would he have cared, had there been a Christian high priest; but if Paul, a Roman citizen, had claimed his protection, he would have cared for that.

Church reformers, and dissenters, have generally set out with professed intentions to limit, or lessen existing power, the persecutions, or opposition of mother churches, tests these professions, if they were insincere, or became unsteady, submission or resistance has followed. The primitive church made no profession or promise of submission to Jewish authority; however it might have been reformed. Under the law the high priesthood was a mere legal office, having no foundation in nature. A government of Fathers, or Elders, is different, it is founded in nature. Age alone can have experience.—The Apostles in the order of time, being the first disciples of the Master, were the fathers and the elders. Elders in all countries, among all people, are the first councilors and rulers—here then is a common model for the government of the primitive church. Where then, is the necessity, or the reason for supposing, that the government was copied from the law of Moses, when there was a well known model of a much older date?

The position, that the government was circumstantial, is indeed, not altogether secure from the consequences, which have been urged against it, viz. that it opens a door for human inventions; but is not this consequence, in some measure counteracted, by the fact, that the new dispensation gives greater light, as well as greater liberty? Let it be kept in view, that the primitive church, was persecuted by the church, in which its first members were born and educated, and with which it held several doctrines in common; and let no attempt be made to invalidate the effects of such a relative state of things; and will not a circumstantial government follow as a necessary consequence? The manner of picking out passages here, and there, to prove an unalterable system of government, is disingenuous. Laws, which like those of the Medes and Persians, alter not, were not surely so made. Supposing now, that a perfect model of government had been given to the primitive church, and of course, a model suited to free, peaceful, and unpersecuting times; could such a model have been reduced to practice before the New Testament was completed? If not, then it must have remained, as a theory. But theory, without example, cannot easily be reduced to practice. It is doubtful, whether the moderns would have been able to reproduce samples of the ancient arts, if they had theory only to study in books. It requires little less genius to reduce a theory to practice, without a model, than to form one.

Paradoxical, then as it may seem, to say that a church, under persecution requires less discipline, than an unpersecuted church; it is evident, that it cannot exercise as much. But persecution, while it may suspend discipline, may con-

tribute in part to supply its place. All opposition and resistance, which does not actually overcome or discourage, the mind acts as a stimulus. Can discipline in a free church excite stronger hopes and fears, than may be produced by persecution? It is admitted as a fact, that the primitive church prospered under persecution; but the cause seems not to have been fully shewn. It seems to be taken for granted, that it was owing to superior discipline, without stopping to enquire how it could have been enforced. A due attention to all the circumstances of the case can hardly fail to satisfy unprejudiced minds, that whatever of right to exercise discipline, may be claimed for the Apostles, that between the Jews and the Romans, their power to do it, must have been very limited. Men who have no power or control over their own lives and liberties are illy prepared to excommunicate others. Much of the governing influence, assumed for the Apostles, is predicated upon a supposition, that they could have done, as church rulers may do, when they have the laws, and public opinion all in their favour.—Now, it has been shewn, that the persecutions of the primitive church were peculiar. They are not to be confounded with those, which originated in the imperial edicts, or with others of a later date. It was emphatically true of those times, that the enemies of Christians were those of their own household. Families were divided between the old religion and the new. How were such relations to be expelled from the new church, without reviving the prejudices of their education, and re-enlisting the sympathies of their former friends? The case of Annanias, is not, properly speaking, an example of discipline. It is rather an evidence of the want of power or of means, in the infant church to exercise it, and the same may be said of other cases of the supernatural kind. But it is relatively true of all churches, under all kinds of persecution, that the regular administration of discipline must be more or less impeded. And it is evident, that an exclusive reliance upon discipline in such cases may defeat its purposes, and instead of purifying the church, divide it into parties, and prepare the way for final ruin. The persecutions of the eastern and western churches (so called) by each other, contributed to the success of the Mahomedans. The Reformers suffered greatly from the same cause; and so also have most of the modern denominations of dissenters. If Mr. Wesley and his societies should be produced as an exception, it should be remembered, that he did not give, and that they did not gain any additional degree of liberty. Wesleyan Methodists do not gain, nor intend to gain more liberty.

The anarchy, into which new churches are apt to fall, is not so much owing to the rejection of all discipline, as to abortive attempts to reduce it to practice. Supposing (as they seem to do) that the new Testament contains a perfect model of church government; and aiming perfectly to copy it, they pay little or no regard to the want of capacity or experience in themselves, or to the influence of hindering causes from without. In view of the formation of a new church, upon more liberal principles, than existed in an old one; the first enquiry should be, whether the old church will oppose the new one, because it is more liberal; and to what extent opposition may impede the operations of discipline; secondly, under what circumstances, and to what extent discipline may be dispensed with. This enquiry may lead to the proper application of the maxim, "Only let your conver-

sation be as becometh the gospel of Christ."—But is it possible, only with such conversation, to dispense with discipline? St. Paul has said that the law was not made for the righteous, that is, it was not made to punish the righteous.—May not the same be said of gospel discipline? Surely it is not intended to punish those, whose conversation becometh the gospel of Christ.—The inherent power of religion is involved in this question. Objectors, resolve religion into priestcraft. Now, if the church cannot exist under any circumstances without discipline, will not the objection lie? And will not the interpretation also sustain itself, which makes the rock, or foundation of the church to be the governing power of St. Peter, and not Christ? The principle of priestcraft, or the art of governing, as an end, is set aside by this statement of the case. The church was not made for government, but government for the church.

It is notorious, that the Methodist Protestant Church, claims for itself more liberty than the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which most of its first ministers and members belonged, and by which, it is now opposed, partly on this very account. Is it possible for this new church, in the first stages of its existence uniformly to exercise discipline like the old church? The prevailing opinion among its ministers and members, seems to be that it is. Little or no attention has been directed towards the immediate effects in newly formed societies, of the disagreements which are apt to arise about the meaning of words; or the still greater difficulty of carrying rules into execution in inexperienced and opposed societies, just rising into being. But the greater liberty of thinking and speaking, and the opposition of a powerful rival may produce strange and unlooked for results among communities unaccustomed to their influence. It is the construction of rules, rather than the rules themselves, which is apt to govern the friends of system, while its enemies aiming only at conquest, are equally regardless of both. Parties to different constructions of their own rules, are sometimes more eager to destroy each other, than the common enemy, whose object is the ruin of them all. To gain experience, then, in a new church, is not to be regarded as a matter of secondary consideration.

Among those who accord to the position, that the primitive church had no system of government, there are those, who mean, that it had none of its own, but copied all from the Jewish church; and that this was the origin of bishops, and of a government of bishops. But upon the score of religious liberty, as has been shewn that nothing can be gained by copying hierarchies. The reformed churches would have gained no liberty by copying the hierarchy of Rome. The Methodist gained none by copying from the hierarchy of the Church of England, and from others. All the government, that was practical in the primitive church, was common to it, and to the primitive governments of the world, in the fathers of families, and the elders of tribes. But fathers do not govern by conventional laws. Now in effect, the Methodist Protestant Church has not had fathers, nor elders. No tacit consent, nor formal agreement was ever made, that any body should be regarded under either these characters. Elders from the beginning were conventional officers; age and priority were accidental. For it was supposed, that to admit of any governing power in fathers, even in the very incipient state of society-ship, is inconsistent with liberty. The

fact, seemed to have been overlooked, that liberty has seldom if ever been secured, when no deference has been paid to those who stood in the relation of fathers to the young and inexperienced community. The apostles taught the primitive church a degree of liberty, which it could never have learned from the Sanhedrim. And what would the consequence have been, if in that infant state, struggling for existence against a potent and organized opposition, all fatherly and senior authority had been resisted, as fatal to liberty. It is in vain to talk of the condition and privileges of manhood, in regard to those who cannot survive infancy. When the primitive church was as a child, did it not think and speak as a child; and was it not nursed as a child; and fed with milk and not with strong meat? Was not the state of its discipline suited to its age? What degree of security or of success had it, that did not depend upon the conformity of its conversation to the gospel of Christ! Behold the triumph of the gospel of Christ! Behold a standing refutation of the infidel objection to religion!! Behold a religion capable of sustaining its friends by its own inherent virtues!!! How often has it been predicted, that this new Methodist Protestant Church would come to nothing? Were these predictions founded upon a belief, that it would not have its conversation as becometh the gospel of Christ? or that it would not maintain a form of government in accordance to the views of these prophets? Probably the latter. But if religion be not allied to state politics; if it be not a mere instrument of human government, why cannot this church exist under a state of things suited to its circumstances.

Let nothing however herein advanced, be so construed, as to authorise an inference, that church discipline is of no virtue. The position to be made out is, that discipline or government not being identical, with religion or its foundation might have been circumstantial, though religion itself is not so.

"There arose a murmuring of the Grecians, against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." No previous rule appears to have existed to meet this case, and the measures taken, merely met the circumstances.—The parties all come together; the Apostles gave advice; and it was followed. This circumstance afterwards changed, and the case was altered; but this kind of office, being recommended by the Apostles, seems to have been retained, and suited to other circumstances. The deacons, or ministers chosen by the people, appear to have been only second to the Apostles; and it should seem, that in process of time, they too gave themselves to the word of God and prayer. In those persecuting times, while almost every thing had to be learned by experience, the oldest in the ministry shared the first and highest degree of confidence, then the next to the last. But in the necessary absence of all, the brethren were to commit their souls, in well doing as unto a faithful Creator.

Let the word opposition, be substituted in the place of persecution. The opposition of the old side Methodists, to those of the new side, has been strong and unremitting, only varying in its modes of operation; and its effects are in several respects, similar to those which were produced in the primitive church, by the persecutions of the Jews. The effects from this opposition are greater and more dreaded, than from any other quarter. The points of agree-

ment between the two parties heightens the rivalry; and it is increased still more by natural relationship, and former friendships, other kinds of opposition, from other sources, had become habitual; but opposition from Methodists was new, and its effects untried; nor must its greater influence upon the public mind be overlooked. Nevertheless many persons in the new church cannot perceive how any of these causes can impede the operations of discipline; not considering that in such a newly formed church, all the habits and associations may be still old,—that little or no new confidence has yet been generated, by examples of doing good, or of resisting evil;—that things remain, as it were, in a kind of embryo of opinion, fluctuating between hopes and fears;—and that the opposition of the old fellowship may impede every new movement. It is believed, that there are many friends of representation in the old church, who are restrained, by prudential fears, from avowing their sentiments, or joining the new church. If it be so, here is another evidence of the manner how opposition frustrates discipline. They had better remain than withdraw, and be impelled by the same fears to return. But those who have courage and resolution enough to meet all consequences, may be only relatively courageous, having but little interest at stake, and of course it may happen, as it often has, that they will not add much credit to the new cause.

But to keep in view, the main point—the possible amount of discipline in a new, a more free, and an opposed church. Disciplining power is new modelled, the ministers, if not new men, are in a new relation; the members are similarly circumstanced, their modes of thinking upon the new subjects may prove very diverse, and respecting forms of action they may both disagree and divide; and all these may operate as causes to induce the old side party to redouble their opposition. What now can be effected by the operations of a discipline, the letter of which is as imperious as it is inflexible?

In some parts of the primitive church, not many wise, nor many noble were called—nor many rich. Which, then, would these good people have been most likely to need most, counsel or discipline? Admitting the probability, that the former was well suited to their condition, may it not be inferred, the choice being left to the apostles, that they were more liberal of it, than of the latter? These newly congregated christians abounding neither in wisdom, wealth nor fame, are not without a parallel in some parts of the newly formed Methodist P. Church. It appears to hold good of all new churches, that not many wise, not many noble are called, and that the poor are more numerous than the rich. Is it wise among such a people to hazard all the consequences of a legal process according to forms of jurisprudence suited to freemen, rather than confide matters of dispute to the friendly advice or decision of some father or elder? Too often, alas! have legal victories, in these circumstances been bought too dearly; the suit being gained, and the church ruined. For these litigants the public are not apt to feel any sympathy; and if they regard the party to which they belong, it is generally to condemn the whole by the sample.

The advocates for a scripture system, seem to take it for granted, that the advice and the exhortations to be found in the New Testament, are parts of the system and proofs of its existence. But according to the position, here argued for, they are to be regarded as the substi-

tutes of a system, and as proofs that it was wanting. Let the trial be made of a few cases.—Peter calls himself an Elder, as well as an Apostle, and exhorts the Elders, to feed the flock of God—to take the oversight of it not as Lords—but as examples; he proceeds to exhort the younger to submit to the elder; and concludes by exhorting all to mutual forbearance and humility. This text, as is well known, has commonly been used to support rival systems, upon the assumption that there actually was one. It is now used to decide between the claims of system and circumstantiality. To which of them is it most favorable? This question might be soon answered if a reference were permitted to all the church laws and disciplines of ancient and modern times; for in not one among them all, are laws, and rules of discipline put in the form of advice or exhortation. Paul also is aged, of course he too is an Elder. He is a father too, for he had begotten children through the gospel, and in his bonds. He tells his children, that they had more instructors than fathers. He travelled in birth again, for those among them whose perseverance he had cause to doubt. And he was gentle among his obedient children, even as a nurse, who cherisheth her children.—Can these and parallel passages be regarded as so many proofs of a complete system of New Testament government, and not rather as supplying the place of one? See the father, see him writing like a father. Is this governing or disciplining; in the proper sense of the term? The professed system makers cannot so understand it; for they not only change the forms, but the very language itself. Moreover, in several instances when formal or legal expulsions might have been proper in the abstract, the innocent are advised to come out, or to withdraw themselves, seeming thus to imply that discipline is not omnipotent. Whoever will read the New Testament so as to let every word, which relates to the conduct of the apostles in the primitive church have its literal meaning—let advice mean advice, and exhortation mean exhortation; and not law, or discipline, will perhaps feel some surprize to find how little statute matter pertaining to church government there is in this body.

If the given position has been sustained, or if it be sustainable, one of the causes of certain instances of want of success, or of defeat, in the M. P. Church will become obvious. It will appear to be the confounding of reform, and the formation of a new church, in whole or in part, out of the members of an elder one, with a view to the gaining and securing of greater liberty. Now in attempts to reform an old church causes for distrust, or want of confidence, in the cases to be reformed, must be implied or supposed. To take away or to limit power, from which nothing had been suffered, and from which nothing is feared is out of all question. Reformers, are not strictly speaking revolutionists, nor should reform and revolution be confounded. The apostles and primitive christians were not reformers, but members of a new church.—In this respect the ministry of the Messiah differed from that of the Apostles, after the day of Pentecost. The former was a species of reform, the latter made all things ecclesiastically new. Now the generality of those persons, who had labored to effect a reform of ministerial power in the M. E. Church, carried their suspicions and jealousies with them into the new church, and acted in conformity to them, in almost all their primary movements. The old ministers in the new church, while they lost all the confidence of the old church, gained but little from

the new. The immediate consequence was, that past experience became in a manner useless, and advice unavailing, upon a new people, having all the habitual distrust of old reformers. No man was confided in as a father; no man trusted as a brother; but all were treated as dishonest, by anticipation—that is, considered as dishonest, because they might become so. Attention was diverted away from the altered cases, that were the results of changed circumstances. It was not duly considered how a disposition useful in one degree, may be injurious in another, nor how much human virtues may be modified by the relation of times and events. An excess of suspicion may in effect, become almost a virtue, in a reformer, while an excess of confidence in new families, friendships or churches, may operate like the virtue of rational confidence itself. Children and youth, it is true, often suffer from too much credulity; but if the suspicion necessary to those of riper years, were to become habitual to them, the virtues of childhood and youth, would either be imperfectly developed, or become abortive. Young friendships, and young churches, require a large stock of confidence to ripen them.

This description of the effects of a lack of early confidence, is no ideal picture, the facts have been seen, felt and deplored. Can discipline correct the evils? Alas! there is no room for sanguine hope here. How often has it proved like adding fuel to the fire. But notwithstanding the instances of disasters from old suspicions in the new church, may not wisdom be gained by the things that have been suffered? A wide field yet remains in which to plant new churches. Let the missionary, the breaker up of new ground, the former of new churches be instructed by the past; let him be admonished, not to begin by sowing the seeds of suspicion and jealousy against himself; but by proving himself worthy of confidence, the confidence of a father of liberty. When he shall have exhausted the eulogy of the new constitution, and the new discipline, let him demonstrate that they are not omnipotent, by shewing that church laws, like strong meat, belong peculiarly to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil; that not only babes in Christ, but infant churches are apt to be unskilful in ecclesiastical courts.

Confidence is the element and food of all society, the mind, the heart, the whole soul craves it. In the absence of true confidence, men become subject to imposition from extreme want, which in this, as in other cases, injures the faculty of discrimination, hence new churches, while distracted with suspicion are so often imposed upon by impostors. Whatever true quality is necessary to society, its absence must be supplied by a false one. But why should men who dare to assert their own liberty, and that of their brethren, at the hazard of every thing, that a powerful rival can deprive them of, be marked out as primary objects of suspicion? Why should all the proofs, that they can give of sincerity be thrown to the winds. A reason is in every mouth, viz: "the burnt child dreads the fire"—we have been deprived of liberty once—but why omit to add, not by those, who promised to give it? There was no bait upon that hook, no disguise; liberty was never held out in perspective, as an object to be finally gained, any more than one to be enjoyed. But to confide in fatherly advisers, and to follow their advice, while in a state of non-experience, is not to place liberty

in jeopardy; not to set a dangerous precedent. The primitive church, being counseled by its fathers, and the fathers of its liberty also; this council, as far as it was followed, made the formalities of law or discipline unnecessary. These fathers by giving advice did not take all power into their own hands, and act at once, as judge, and jury, and executives of the law; nor was the confidence of the church equivalent to a renunciation of its rights. It is argued, that, by reason of persecution the Apostles could not, if they would have exercised much discipline; but they did give much advice, and that when the church had confidence enough in them to follow it, no injury was suffered for the want of discipline. Am I, said St. Paul, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth? Again, says he, I know that after my departure, grievous wolves shall enter among you not sparing the flock; ye of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, seeking to draw away disciples after them. Why after his departure? The father, the counselor was gone. The judaizing teachers (so called) while the apostle lived, did all they could to effect these purposes; and whenever confidence in the Apostles, and fathers of liberty failed, they were but too successful. These men, of course, would have sustained the high priesthood in all its powers and prerogatives, as well as other parts of the law for which they were so exceedingly zealous.

The manner, in which, a greater degree of liberty was introduced into the primitive church, and into the M. P. Church, may now be recapitulated. The apostles were the fathers, and founders of the liberty of the primitive church; the laity or members were learners. The latter therefore had no more reason to suspect the former as opposers or betrayers of liberty, than children have to suspect their fathers when they propose to them, or promise them any greater good. St. Paul's maxim was, that the children ought not to lay up for the parents; but the parents for the children. Unwearied attempts were made to entangle the disciples of the Messiah again, in the legal yoke of bondage, and they were only rescued, by the zeal and perseverance of the fathers of liberty. It is true, that freedom of government, is not particularly mentioned, as a part of Christian liberty; but that it was included, or implied, is to be inferred, from the nature of the case. The men who came from Jerusalem to Antioch, taught that Christian converts could not be saved, except they were circumcised, and kept the whole law of Moses, which would have brought them immediately under the power of the Jewish priesthood. The real converts to true christianity then, did not view themselves as the rivals, or competitors of the Apostles, in the cause of liberty; but as their children and pupils; and in this acknowledged relation, confidence was the basis of almost every movement, pertaining to government. The germ or nucleus of the Methodist Protestant Church, was the associations of the expelled members of the M. E. Church, who had learned and taught liberty, as promoters and friends of a reform of ministerial power. When they came together, therefore, in their new relation, they regarded each other in no other light, than as friends and companions in adversity. The relation of parent and child, or of teacher and learner, did not exist, nor was it admitted. And all were as masters in Israel. Now the convention, which gave the present constitution and name to the new church, were placed on a common level, without any regard to times or circumstances, or any older relation-

ship. Those who had been expelled for the sake of liberty, or had withdrawn, before, or after the time of the expulsions, neither asked, nor received any precedence, nor were considered as inferior. In the convention too, the relation of parent or children, or of teacher and learner, existed not.

It remains to recapitulate, upon the circumstances of those societies, or parts, which have been added to the M. P. Church since the convention, or that may hereafter be added. These also, all become equals, and masters in Israel. They have neither parent minister, or parent church; the constitution and discipline, that are given them, become the creatures of their opinions; all are supposed to understand, and to judge for themselves of these important contents, as by a kind of instinct, or intuition, neither men nor means being provided to teach any one. From this (conceived to be) fair view, may it not be inferred, that the liberties, or the rights and privileges of the M. P. Church, may in every respect be in accordance with those of the primitive church; and yet, that the former may fail in an indefinite number of instances, not from any natural incapacity in man for free government; but inattention to circumstances.

The points of agreement, in these three cases, have not been enumerated and marked, partly because they are obvious, and partly because circumstances are still changeable. But two cases may be quoted from the New Testament, which may lead to an inquiry for a parallel in the M. P. Church, "Where is the blessedness ye spake of, for I bear you record, that had it been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them unto me."—"They fell on Paul's neck and wept, sorrowing most of all for the words that he spake, they should see his face no more." In the first of these cases the confidence in the beginning must have been very strong, but failed; in the second, it continued to the last. In both cases however, must not all admit, that advice enough would have been taken, either to prevent offences, or to have corrected them without recourse to discipline, that is, judge, jury, witnesses, explaining law, and cross examinations, and such like proceedings? Confidence, it is fair to presume, would have prevented church trials rather than operate as an inducement to submit to apostolic decisions after the trials. How many cases have occurred, of such confidence in the M. P. Church? Who have shown a willingness, had it been possible to give their eyes to the ministers of church liberty? or who have sorrowed most of all, for that last parting word—see my face no more? Nothing is more striking to the mind of a preacher, who has had much experience, and means of observation in both churches, than the falling off of confidence in the new church, even were there are no actual expressions of suspicion, or aversion. Frequent examples of change from confidence to suspicion, in changing churches, is surely no proof of physical incapacity for free government, or that men can only be governed as with a rod of iron, for if it were, the same causes and effects would have been found in the primitive church.

SENEX.

If I might have my beloved enjoyment, and live cordially to my own will as long as I pleased, do I believe that I should choose to die soon, and go to heaven for the sake of being with God, and freed from sin?

For the Methodist Protestant.

SENEX AND AMICUS.

Mr. Editor,—I have read with great attention and interest, a communication from "Senex," and another from "Amicus," on obedience and responsibility, as necessary to all good government. Those brethren both deserve well of the Christian public for their literary labours; and it is hoped that their pens will continue active for a number of years to come.

May heaven spare and bless our beloved "Senex," that he may pursue such themes with his pen, in the retirement of declining life, after the infirmities of age have in a great measure deprived us of his pulpit instructions. His late tour to the — regions, appears to have compelled him to view human nature in a light somewhat different from former years; and happy will it be for our community, if "Amicus" should be brought to cast away the "bag of pebbles" as effectually as his friend "Senex" appears to have done.

Various sentiments in the paper of this elder brother are so valuable, that I regret the want of time to comment upon them. "Amicus" has also written a clear and judicious essay; but I think in one place he has mistaken the meaning of his friend. When "Senex" said "more power might safely be given to responsible rulers of the irresponsible party," he meant more power in some parts of the government, not *universally*. And, thus qualified, I presume his position could be successfully defended. Time will not admit of my entering upon its defence at present, however, nor is it deemed necessary.

Brother "Amicus" advances a sentiment with which I entirely concur: it is, "If an officer be clothed with any degree of power, he is not culpable for exercising it to the full extent: he is only culpable on two grounds, first for omitting to exercise the authority given when cases call for its exertion; and secondly, for employing more power than is actually conferred on him. In either case he would be guilty of mal-administration. There should no more power be put into the hands of executive officers than is strictly necessary for the purposes of good government." Senex would not dispute this: but he thought that in some parts of the administration more power would be necessary, "in a new church like ours," than in an old irresponsible establishment.

"We are decidedly of the opinion," says Amicus, "that the constitution and discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church do clothe her rulers with ample power for all the purposes of good government;" and he calls upon Senex "to point out those weak places in our system, which need strengthening; and to show us what officers in our church are not clothed with sufficient power." These sentences surprised me a little; because Amicus himself has lately recommended certain alterations in our constitution and discipline, which, to my understanding, are evidently calculated to give more ample powers.

"If anarchy be likely to obtain any where within our borders," he continues, "it is not because the rules are defective, or that the rulers are not clothed with sufficient power to execute discipline; but it must be either because the officers do not go forth in the faithful discharge of duty, or because there is a spirit of insubordination in the ministers or members of some of the churches." That these causes have operated to a considerable extent, is probably true; for the sentiment seems quite prevalent in some places, among preachers and people, that a free

church government signifies exactly, that we are to have a nice discipline to look at and talk about, and then for every man to do what is right in his own eyes. We depend on our good principles to do every thing; and to tell a warm-hearted republican reformer that he is to obey the discipline, is almost to astonish him. This, he thinks, is to deprive us of our liberty, and to carry us back again into Egypt. Now what is this but the spirit of anarchy? And how difficult does such a spirit make it, for church officers to execute discipline, unless sustained by a sufficient amount of energy in the church, and especially in subordinate officers."

A superintendent cannot execute discipline but through the agency of class-leaders and others. If they refuse to obey him, when he enjoins obedience to the discipline, how can he maintain "good government," unless he possess power to arrest the disobedient officer, and have him put out of office! And even after this should be done, it would avail nothing, if the superintendent is to exercise no agency in putting a better officer in his place. If he have no power, either to put men into office who are to be his aids in the administration, or to put them out when delinquent, it is perfectly unjust and ridiculous to hold him responsible for the general execution of discipline in his circuit or station. This power, we admit, ought to be limited and checked; but does this mean, to make him perfectly powerless, and then command him "to execute discipline," and hold him to a strict responsibility?

Our friend "Amicus" says, moreover, that there is not "any community of free Protestants more willing to yield prompt and cheerful obedience where obedience is requisite, than are the great majority of Methodist Protestants."—He must excuse brother "Senex" and myself, if we cannot exercise quite so strong faith. We are willing to hope all things; and we believe thousands of valuable members in our community are disposed to check the threatening spirit around them; but though we trust there is energy enough in most places to suppress the evil before it becomes incurable, yet this will never be done by denying the existence of the disease, or by neglecting to apply a remedy. I must not deny myself the pleasure of giving a specimen of our friend "Senex's" eloquence on this subject: "Anarchy! shall this most fatal of all diseases become epidemic, among a people just struggling for a responsible ministry? if it be yet in our power to prevent it, soon it may be forever too late. Save us brethren, O! save us from the irredeemable and eternal curse of anarchy. Place sufficient power in the hands of your rulers to govern; and let the conviction sink deep in every heart, that no evil can befall us, or prove more ruinous to our character than disobedience and insubordination."

That brother Amicus is right in supposing this delinquency may be in both preachers and people, there is no reason to doubt. Some of our superintendents may be too cowardly to use the power they already possess, or they may have become infected with the disease themselves. They probably yield up their authority, and the government along with it, either through indifference to order, or from a fear of those around them.

The truth is, Mr. Editor, that the sovereign people love power as well as any body, and take equal delight in exercising the mastery. Take an example. A certain passive superintendent among us, not a thousand miles from whence I

write, had a large protracted meeting, at which were several fellow labourers to assist him in the ministry. The people took it into their heads that they had a right to make out the appointments for the preachers, or to determine who should preach at this hour, and who at that.—The superintendent being soft and yielding, and a good republican, suffered it to be so. Soon a confusion and a strife arose. One of the sovereigns decided that this minister should preach first; another said nay, but the other shall preach first; a third dissented from both, and urged his claim for a distinct nomination; the consequence was, that the hour of preaching came before the matter was adjusted; the preachers were all unprepared; and a kind of hurried and forced sermon had to be delivered, to save the church from scandal and disgrace before the whole congregation. Of these circumstances I was informed by an intelligent lay brother, who was present on the occasion, and whose good judgment saw and deplored the deep disease of anarchy which threatens ruin to our institutions.

It is true, there was no lack of power in the superintendent, in this instance; for the discipline made it his express duty "to fill the pulpits, or have them filled." But the circumstance is mentioned to prove two things: first, that our cause may be ruined by the ministers themselves, either by their having imbibed the spirit of anarchy, or by their being too cowardly to discharge their own official duty; and secondly, that the love of power is the common disease of human nature, and that the people are as fond of assuming an authority which does not belong to them, as any priest-hood in the universe.

I must say, after all, with thankfulness to Almighty God, that the dignified and energetic course pursued by the last Ohio Annual Conference, encouraged me more, far more, than any thing I have witnessed since the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. Let them persevere—let all the annual conferences harmonize in energetic operations—let all the officers of the government carry out the same wholesome order through the administration of the year—and we shall be terrible as an army with banners. Healthful and strong in our own constitution, and relying upon the great Head of the church, we can bid defiance to all external assailants, and by the strength of our God we will leap over a wall. Indeed, it is as plain to my mind as day light, that if ever our new church be destroyed, it will be by an act of suicide: it is not the number or the power of our opponents that we have to fear; but the internal disease of a blind and foolish notion of democratic liberty, which arises from the sovereign pride of human nature, and which at this day threatens the destruction of our civil institutions, as well as that of the Methodist Protestant Church.

BARTIMEUS.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Mr. Editor,—Being myself pleased with the following extract from Saurin's Sermons, I send it to you for publication in the Methodist Protestant.

John.

CHARACTER OF A PROSELYTE.

"In all characters in life, there are few so respectable as that of a real proselyte. A man who changes his religion on pure principles, has a greatness of soul above common men. I venture to advance this general maxim, that a man who changes his religion, must be consummate either in virtue or vice. If he be insincere, he is a wretch, if he be not a wretch, he is

a hero. He is a hero if his virtue be sincere, if he makes generous efforts to correct errors imbibed in his earliest youth, if he can see without trembling that path of tribulation which is generally opened to such as forsake their religion, and if he can bear all the suppositions which are generally made against them who renounce the profession of their ancestors; if, I say, he can do all this, he is a hero."

Here follows some remarks found in a recent number of the "Canadian Wesleyan," from which it appears that some of the most important stations are not willing to be bartered into foreign hands.

"Notice.—We read in the Guardian of October 23d, under the caption of "Duty of Methodists at the present juncture," and "our long undetermined regulations are now finally settled—our long unsettled institutions are now permanently established." Now, were this actually the case, what does it establish, and what are we to understand from it?—Does it not establish at once, and that beyond a query, that Methodist Episcopacy has told the truth, in saying, that its very basis trembled under a fear of the consequences of its "unsettled" state in Canada, and that during that unsettled state, a unity of principle has only been kept in existence by false colors and misrepresentations? And further, we deem it our duty to warn our friends, and particularly the Wesleyan emigration, of the imminent danger of their being too hastily led into a belief that all is amicably fixed and established, even with reference to the Methodist union. Let the Methodists of Upper Canada know that the present course and arrangements are very unsatisfactory, further than a unicensy of feeling may be effected by power and duplicity; however, we shall, perhaps, say but little more on the subject, until something more decisive shall be made known. In the meantime, we would call the attention of our readers to the following article which we copy from the York Courier, and which, no doubt will yield information of the greatest importance to British Methodists in Canada:—

"The Rev. John Barry, late minister of the British Wesleyan congregation of this town, who left the place in consequence of the late mock Union between Mr. Marsden and the American Methodists, arrived in town this morning, in company with the Rev. Mr. Sutcliffe, (British Wesleyan minister from Montreal,) who is about to take charge of the congregation lately under the pastoral care of Mr. Barry of this town, to be totally unconnected with the Ryersonian American Methodists, or with any persons connected with them. The Rev. Mr. Barry returns to Montreal to take the place of Mr. Sutcliffe, to be also entirely unconnected with the Ryersonian faction.

The whole of the British Methodists at Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, and York, are united in their determination, to have nothing whatever to do with the faction in question, or with any pretended union which may have been effected with them by Mr. Marsden or any body else: to which "union" the British Methodists of these Colonies have not only not been party, but to which they have, and from the disaffected and anti-British political character of that faction—they must ever be averse. The British Methodists, we learn, are indignant at the assumption, by the said faction, of the title of "The Wesleyan Methodist Church in British

North America,"—thus engrossing nominally the denomination of the whole Methodist people of all the British provinces in America."

OBITUARY.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Alexandria, D. C. Nov. 4, 1833.

Mr. Editor,—Believing it due to the late Rev. C. W. JACOBS, that some notice of his loss to the Methodist Protestant Church, as well as to his friends, should be taken notice of through the columns of your paper, and having waited now more than three months for an abler pen, I hope one who was intimately acquainted with him, and knew how to appreciate his worth, will be excused for doing the best he can.

Mr. Jacobs was born at Alexandria, D. C. October 28, 1812, of pious parents, who endeavoured to bring him up in the fear of the Lord. At a very early period he evinced a degree of intelligence not usual in children of his age, which was noticed and spoken of by almost all who knew him.—He was sent to school at the usual age, to a pious lady, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to whom he was no doubt, indebted for many of his earliest religious impressions:—she is also gone to reap her reward; and there is no doubt that while I am writing, she and her pupil are re-united in the great school above, in learning to praise the Lord more perfectly for all his mercies conferred on them while in this state of probation. I have no doubt there are many who will bless the name of Susanna Tesey while they live, and will praise the Lord forever that they were put under the tuition of such a mother in Israel. Mr. J. manifested from the beginning an ardent desire for learning; he laid it down as a rule, not to be conquered; and therefore during his leisure moments, instead of being seen in the street at play, as is common for children, he was seen alone in his study, or some other convenient place, perusing over his lesson, and would never give over until he had accomplished his object; even then he would not be found unemployed, but would be seen at something instructive or useful. Such was the progress that he made in his studies, that the mistress in a very short time informed his father that he must be sent to a master, as she could teach him no more than he already knew. Such was his industry and close application to business, that it was never known or heard of, that he received a single stripe from any of his teachers;—this advancement may be judged of by the fruit of his labour, as at every public exhibition he was sure to carry off the prize, together with the heart-cheering reflection that he had obtained the approbation of the wise and good. On one occasion he acquitted himself so handsomely, that the Rev. Doctor Wilmer, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this city, placed his hands on his little head, in the presence of the whole school and a large assembly of spectators, and invoked the blessing of heaven upon him.

Mr. J. seemed to be conscientious in loving and obeying the truth.—He had an utter abhorrence to lying or deceit, or any thing of the kind:—he was never known to stoop to a mean action, and his good conduct through life obtained for him the confidence and affections of all who knew him.* He used to say, while

* He was never known to have a dispute or falling out with any of his juvenile associates;—

going to school, that he should like to be a teacher, that it would afford him much satisfaction to be instrumental in raising young men to be useful to their country and fellow beings. At the age of 16, he had so far completed his education as to leave school, having obtained a good English education, a considerable knowledge of the Greek and Latin, together with the French Language, of which he had, according to the judgment of his teacher, a better knowledge than nine tenths of those who are born in France. About this time he was sent for by a Mr. Murry, to take charge of a school near Elkrige Landing, Md. but he was not long there before he informed his father he should be obliged to return home, as it did not suit his genius.—He came home, and placed himself under Mr. Robert I. Taylor, a distinguished counsellor of this city, to study law; but soon ascertained that this also was opposed to the natural bent of his mind; he therefore informed his father of his intention to quit this also, assigning as a reason, that as law is not always justice, he would, to make himself popular, have to study, to take every advantage of law and justice, in order to make the cause of his client good; to which means he could not condescend to get his bread. His father then directed him to follow the bodings of his own mind; and in August following, 1828, he went with his father to a Camp-meeting in Westmoreland county, Va. when his mind became awakened; and during the meeting he was in deep distress on account of sin: he however returned home without having found peace, and remained in this state of mind for several days, when being alone in his chamber, pleading with God for mercy, he obtained the pearl of great price, even forgiveness of sins, through the merits of Christ. He immediately communicated it to his father, informing him at the same time, that he believed it to be his duty to call sinners to repentance, and that the impression had been frequently on his mind from the time he was seven years of age.—This was some time in the fall of 1828. He immediately joined the 1st Presbyterian Church, and undertook the study of divinity, under the Rev. Elias Harrison. His reasons for joining the Presbyterian in preference to the Methodist Episcopal Church, where his father and friends were members, were, that he was opposed from principle to its government; he well knew that if he joined them and offered himself to the conference as a travelling preacher, he must, before he could obtain ordination, express his attachment to, and his love for its government;—this he could not do. Notwithstanding he was loved and respected by the pastor and members of the Presbyterian church, a difficulty presented itself which resulted in his withdrawing himself therefrom, viz: its doctrines, together with the time it would take him before he could obtain ordination. The Methodist Protestant Church having sprung up about this time, he opened his mind to his pastor on the subject of scruples, telling him, that if he wished to live among them, and be acceptable, he must preach their doctrine, which he could not conscientiously do. To a friend he said as follows: "if I continue where I am, and find

but had so far gained their esteem and confidence, as well as that of his teacher, that if any difficulties or disputes arose among them, of which he had any knowledge, his word was taken by all concerned, and his judgment settled the dispute.

reasons to induce me to believe the doctrine, yet the time it will take to pursue my studies, will embrace several years; and if it be my duty to preach, it is my duty to preach now; besides, if I should die before I get ordination, how can I account to my Maker for my call to preach, and the souls committed to my trust?" How remarkable that he should have died before he could have obtained ordination! Mr. H. on hearing his objections, directed him to follow the impressions of the Spirit on his mind, telling him it was his duty to join a branch of the Christian church, in which he thought he could be most useful, and obtained for him a written discharge from the session of the church, and gave him a written recommendation to the conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, of which the following is a correct copy:

Alexandria, March 26, 1829.

This certifies, that the bearer, Charles W. Jacobs, is now, and has been for the last six months, a member of the 1st Presbyterian Church in this town in full communion, in good and regular standing—being about to remove to Baltimore, he is hereby dismissed at his own request, with the view of uniting himself to one of the churches in that city. To the christian communion and fellowship of which, he is most cordially recommended.

Signed by order of the Session,

ELIAS HARRISON,

Pastor of the above named Church.

In addition to the above certificate of membership, I would state as an Individual, that the bearer has long sustained a character not only free from reproach, but of unblemished moral worth;—that since my personal acquaintance with him, he has given satisfactory evidence of sincere, decided and devoted godliness,—that he has made considerable progress in the attainment of classic literature and physical science, and that I have regarded him as possessing gifts and graces qualifying him for usefulness in the church of Christ. E. H.

Mr. J.— joined the Md. Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church in the spring of 1829, in the 17th year of his age, and continued therein proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ to all within his reach, until he was called to share in its glorious rewards around his father's throne in heaven.—He was an acceptable and useful minister of the church upwards of four years. He died at Easton, Eastern Shore of Maryland, in the full triumphs of faith, July 20, 1833, in the 21st year of his age, beloved and respected by all who knew him.

Being conscious Mr. Editor, that I have not done that justice to the subject or the character of a departed friend that they require, yet I have the consolation to know that I have done the best I can, I now leave it with you for any corrections either of style or language, or any thing else it may need, together with any additions necessary: and if there is nothing already before you on the subject, I hope you will give it a place in the Methodist Protestant.

One who loved C. W. Jacobs dearly, and who will ever cherish his memory.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Died, October 21st, in Centreville, Queen Anne's co. Maryland, Miss MARY ROGERS, aged 34 years.

Miss Rogers, through some dispensation of providence, became blind when she was eight

years old, and never recovered her sight. She obtained regeneration of heart by the Spirit of God at the age of nineteen, a lively sense of which, it is believed, she never lost. She was a zealous professor of religion in the Methodist Episcopal church, until the Methodist Protestants seceded, among the first of whom she was one. From that time till her death she continued an unwavering member of the Methodist Protestant Church. Her life and character ornamented the doctrines of the gospel. Her religious experience was genuine, and her death remarkably triumphant. A few hours before her departure, she, in the most pathetic manner, exhorted her class-mates to faithfulness and perseverance; and by all means to meet her in heaven. *"Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."* Rev. xiv. 13.

J. M. K.



BALTIMORE:

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1833.

We rejoice that our ministers and members, generally, perceive the want of more efficiency in our government. We mean an efficiency which shall prompt all our Church officers to perform their scriptural and church duties—but let no one suppose for a moment, that by efficiency in the government, we intend power to oppress any individual, or subordinate bodies—Not so. We mean by more efficiency in our government, that every officer in the Church should be expected only to perform such duties as are scriptural, proper, and highly necessary for the purposes of good government. If these officers be indispensable to carry into practical use the duties required by the gospel, and the just demands of the Church, how indispensably necessary is it, that their duties should be explicitly defined, and also the power or the authority to discharge the duties of their office.

Is it right that the members and ministers should be under law to Christ and the Church—then they should be accountable to Christ and the Church. If there be laws ordained by the Head of the Church, and proper regulations by the church to carry those laws into effectual operation, surely we will admit, that some persons must be appointed to see that these laws are not violated with impunity, and that the transgressor be punished.—We do not say that there are not many wholesome provisions in our Constitution and Discipline, but some of these require to be more in detail and better defined.

Our members, by becoming such, avow that they desire to flee the wrath to come—and avow further, that they desire to be saved from their sins—and more, they avow that they will evidence these desires by doing every possible good, and by abstaining from every evil.—But we ask if the expression of those good desires, is to exonerate them from all future responsibility to Christ and the Church, because they have avowed those good desires. In other words, does the avowal of them render the member infallible? Is he or she made holy by the avowal of them, and placed beyond the possibility of losing those good desires? Or do those desires, expressed at the time of their admission into the Church place them forever beyond the power of temptation, or of falling from grace? Certainly not—and sad expe-

rience and every day's observation serve to shew hundreds who have professed those good desires, and have become in months or years afterwards, immoral in their lives, a nuisance to the church, and pests to the civil community. These must be made accountable to the church—but how shall they be made accountable to the whole church, except through officers, delegated by the church to attend to such cases?

If there be no recognition of those offenders, the church is scandalized, and Christ its Head, is crucified afresh in His own house.

On the other hand, does the circumstance of a member becoming a minister, and avowing that he feels it to be his duty to preach the gospel, render him infallible? Is he to be under no law, because he has taken upon him the office of a minister? Does the office render him impervious to the influence of temptation? Let the history of the church, in all ages, speak out its mournful answer, which is, that some who have ministered at the altar, have become a disgrace to the ministry, a curse to the church, and a pest to society. Are these to be free from law to the church? God forbid.

Can these be made accountable, except through officers appointed by the church, whose duty it is to see that no flagrant abberation from the law of God be tolerated in the church of God?

Are we members of the church—we are required to live Godly in Christ Jesus, to attend to the institutions, ordinances, and means of grace generally. Can we be Christians and neglect these, and are we not to be accountable?

Are we ministers, and have we a dispensation of the gospel, and can we omit our duties—neglect appointments to preach the word of God? Have we classes to meet—the poor and the afflicted to comfort, especially to visit the widow and the fatherless. The children to instruct in the principles of our holy Religion. The ordinance of Baptism to administer, the dead to inter with all suitable promptness and solemnity. Are we charged with the office of peace-makers in the church, and of sympathising with the bereaved and the suffering?

Are ministers charged to be instant, to do good in season and out of season, charged to feed the flock of Christ regularly with the bread of life; and to be examples of meekness, love and forbearance, whilst they are to rebuke with firmness the froward.—Are all these, with many other duties, required at the hands of the minister by Christ and the church, and shall he be permitted to neglect these indispensable duties, and not be accountable to the church? We say God forbid. Common sense and divine revelation, both forbid it. Are we now understood? We think we are. Is there a member or minister of our church who would be opposed to such efficiency being imparted by the church to some definite authority, which shall see that the church is preserved from unworthy members and ministers—those who neglect their duties, and those who transgress the commands of Christ and the regulations of the church. If neglect and wilful transgression be tolerated in the member, is it not to be expected that both will be tolerated also in the minister?

There is great necessity that every one should know his and her place in the church, and that they fill them punctually. We are truly thankful to Almighty God for the promptness with which many fulfil their obligations to Christ and the church; these are the ornaments of the age, and crowns of glory to the church. These are for a name and a praise in the earth. O that their number may daily increase. Let us each follow these as they follow Christ.

The next ensuing General Conference, will no doubt make such provisions as shall be best calculated, in their opinion, to carry into effect such general laws as are in accordance with the Constitution and the word of God, and

are necessary to secure a uniformity of practice throughout each and all of the Conferences, so far as the state laws will permit. Unless this be done, it is not necessary to say what will be the results. We leave this subject to the calm consideration of every member and minister, only remarking, that in our opinion, the General Conference will not close its sittings without adopting such measures as will secure a uniform practice.

In our next, we shall furnish the terms of union between a part of the Canadian Methodists, and the Wesleyan Methodists, of England. If we have any foresight whatever, we are of opinion, that this sudden union of heterogeneous materials will involve ruin either to one party or the other.

There are too many qualifications on each side, to induce the hope that these will not be reserved and acted on up to their full latitude. Time will determine.

Such of our friends and brethren abroad, as wish the Books published by the Methodist Protestant Book Agent, will please address him on the subject, post paid, stating the number of each kind wanting.

This is the more necessary to be attended to immediately, as the navigation may become obstructed, if deferred a few weeks longer.

JOHN J. HARROD,
Book Agent, M. P. Church.

November 15, 1833.



POETRY.

For the Methodist Protestant.

ACROSTICK.

While under sense of guilt I lay,
I with the Lord did strive and pray,
Look down in mercy on my soul!
Let Jesus' blood bespeak me whole!
"I will forgive" (the Lord he said,)—
"A ransom has for thee been paid,
"My Son for thee has bled and died.

"Justice now is satisfied,
"Arise and shine thy light is come,
"Call other wandering sinners home,
"Keep thee I will till time shall end,
"So tell poor sinners I'm their friend."
O may his love my heart constrain!
Nor suffer me to call in vain!

CHRISTIAN CONFIDENCE.

'Tis only when the sea's at rest:
And sunshine gilds the liquid plains:
To say "How could I be distressed
In storms, since God my Father reigns!"

But when the Sky puts terrors on,
And tempests blow and billows rise,
That confidence—how quickly gone!
Which seemed so strong in tranquil Skies.

Prosperity can never try
The Strength and value of our trust,
But sorrows and adversity,
When we are humbled to the dust.

Oh, for that faith which firm shall stand
When grief my earthly Sky deforms;
And sees a heavenly Pilot's hand,
'Midst threatening gulfs and dangerous storms.

JAMES EDMISTON.